

United States Patent and Trademark Office



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS Washington, D.C. 20231 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/555,371	05/30/2000	NOBUYA SATO	0327-0840-3	8292
7	590 12/03/2002			
OBLON SPIV	OBLON SPIVAK MCCLELLAND EXAMINER		INER	
1755 JEFFERS	ER & NEUSTADT 5 JEFFERSON DAVIS HIGHWAY 5 PRATT, CHRISTOPHER C		STOPHER C	
FOURTH FLOOR CRYSTAL SQUARE FIVE ARLINGTON, VA 22202		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
,	,		1771	11
			DATE MAILED: 12/03/2002	: //

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Advisory Action	Application No. 09/555,371 Examiner Christopher C Pratt	Applicant(s) SATO ET AL. Art Unit 1771
Advisory Action	Examiner Christopher C Pratt	Art Unit
	Christopher C Pratt	
		1771
The MAILING DATE of this communication appear		
	rs on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address
THE REPLY FILED 22 November 2002 FAILS TO PLACE Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to avo inal rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) a condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal (Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.	oid abandonment of this applicate a timely filed amendment which	ation. A proper reply to a
PERIOD FOR REP	PLY [check either a) or b)]	•
a) The period for reply expires <u>3</u> months from the mailing date of		
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Adno event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire late ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS F706.07(f). Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of ee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the	er than SIX MONTHS from the mailing FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THate on which the petition under 37 CFI extension and the corresponding amo e shortened statutory period for reply	g date of the final rejection. IE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP R 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension of the fee. The appropriate extension of the fee. The appropriate extension or ignally set in the final Office action; o
2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office imely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFI	R 1.704(b).	
 A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant's E 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 		
The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered bed	cause:	
(a) they raise new issues that would require further	consideration and/or search (s	see NOTE below);
(b) they raise the issue of new matter (see Note be	low);	
(c) they are not deemed to place the application in issues for appeal; and/or	better form for appeal by mate	rially reducing or simplifying the
(d) they present additional claims without canceling NOTE:	g a corresponding number of fi	nally rejected claims.
 Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection 	n(s):	
 Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be canceling the non-allowable claim(s). 	e allowable if submitted in a se	eparate, timely filed amendment
5. ☐ The a ☐ affidavit, b ☐ exhibit, or c ☐ request for reapplication in condition for allowance because: See		dered but does NOT place the
6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered becauraised by the Examiner in the final rejection.	use it is not directed SOLELY t	o issues which were newly
7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment(s explanation of how the new or amended claims would be appeared to the proposed amendment of t		
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:		
Claim(s) allowed:		
Claim(s) objected to:		
Claim(s) rejected: <u>1-8 and 11-14</u> .		
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: <u>9-10</u> .		
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: <u>9-10</u> . 8. The proposed drawing correction filed on is a)☐ approved or b)☐ disapp	roved by the Examiner.
— ·-		•

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicant's amendments overcome the 112 rejections previously set forth. With respect the prior art rejection, applicant argues that it would not have been obvious to increase the thickness of McGuire's film. Applicant argues that the examiner used impermissible hindsight as the proffered motivations set forth in the previous action. The examiner's motivations were: to increase absorbency of the material and to increase protection to the substance wrapped in the material. These motivations appear to be different from those used by applicant. It is the examiner's position that it would be plain to the skilled artisan that by increasing the thickness of a material more space would be provided to trap moisture, thereby improving the absorbent properties of the material. Similarly, the skilled artisan would easily understand that increasing a materials thickness would reduce its ability to be inadvertently ripped or torn, thereby increasing its ability to protect substances wrapped in the material. The examiner notes that a change in size is generally recognized as being within the level of ordinary skill in the art. In re Rose 105 USPQ 237 (CCPA 1955).

Moreover, McGuire specifically teaches that the size, height, and shape of the material can all be altered in order to vary the deformability and crushability properties of the material (col. 7, lines 59-61 and col. 8, lines 45-55). Said rejection is maintained from the last action.

PRIMAPONE